

### **DETAILED ACTION**

The instant application having Application No. 10/598936 filed on 9/15/06 is presented for examination by the examiner.

#### ***Priority***

Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d). The certified copy has been received.

#### ***Claim Objections***

Claim 6 is objected to because of the following informalities: the use of the phrase "and/or" confounds the determination of the scope because it raises a question as to whether both limitations or just one limitation are required to meet the breadth of the claim. The examiner is interpreting the claim in the alternative fashion, *or*.

Claim 12 is objected to because of the following informalities: the use of the phrase "further device". The word further does not seem to carry the intended meaning of the claim.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter of software, per se. The claim lacks the necessary physical articles or objects to constitute a machine or manufacture within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 101. The claim lacks the necessary computer readable storage medium to have a tangible object.

Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Signals are not one of the statutory classes of invention.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:  
The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-4, and 6-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

As per claims 1-4 and 6-22, the claims are generally narrative and indefinite, failing to conform to current U.S. practice. They appear to be a literal translation into English from a foreign document and are replete with grammatical and idiomatic errors. Phrases such as "further range" do not seem to agree with idea of the invention. Examiner asserts these are literal translation of the foreign document and could use a

human revision to accurately define the scope of the invention using more common English phrases.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "said ranges". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 6 recites the limitations "the second range", "the first range", the first authorization status, and "the second authorization status". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 7, similarly has and insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claims 6, 7, 8, and 9 are all rejected as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 6 and 7 depend on canceled claim 5. It is impossible to determine the scope of claims 6-9 because they all lack an independent claim in their pendency tree.

Claims 16-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically these claims fail to further limit the independent claim 1 which they all ultimately depend from. It appears applicant has tried to write these claims in independent form but they are dependent on claim 1. As such, they should further limit the parent claim which is a method of generating an authorization status list. Claim 16 is directed to a device, 17 to a computer program, 18

to a source device, 19-21 to a record carrier, and 22 to a signal. Examiner is treating them as dependent claim as they are in dependent form.

Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-4 and 6-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by USP 7,337,315 to Micali.

As per claim 1, Micali teaches a method of generating an authorization status list, comprising:

generating a run-length encoded representation of an authorization status of a number of devices (col. 15, line 55-col. 16, line 5); and

storing the representation in the authorization status list by indicating the number of devices in each of said ranges for each of a number of ranges of devices, the devices in a particular range having a same authorization status (col. 10, lines 51-61).

As per claim 2, Micali teaches indicating the authorization status shared by the devices in each of said ranges in the authorization status list for each of said ranges (col. 11, lines 36-40).

As per claim 3, Micali teaches indicating boundary of said ranges in the authorization status list (col. 10, line 57).

As per claim 4, Micali teaches a device identifier as a boundary (col. 11, lines 47-48).

As per claim 6, Micali teaches the second range is successive to the first range and the first authorization status differs from the second authorization status (col. 11, lines 47-48).

As per claim 7, Micali teaches omitting a further range if the further range is of a predetermined length (col. 11, lines 47-48).

As per claim 8, Micali teaches the predetermined length equals one (col. 12, lines 30-35).

As per claim 9, Micali teaches comprising indicating in the authorization status list the predetermined length (col. 11, lines 47-48).

As per claim 10, Micali teaches a number of bits used to indicate the number of devices in each of said ranges (col. 11, lines 48-49).

As per claim 11, Micali teaches indicating in the authorization status list a version number or a creation date (col. 4, line 5).

As per claim 12, Micali teaches transmitting the authorization status list to a device for verifying its authorization status or of a further device (col. 21, lines 45-50).

As per claim 13, Micali teaches recording the authorization status list on a storage medium (col. 26, line 1).

As per claim 14, Micali teaches the authorization status list in a fixed data area of a rewritable storage medium (col. 26, lines 1-5).

As per claim 15, Micali teaches recording the authorization status list in a rewritable area of a rewritable storage medium and recording a cryptographic summary (col. 19, lines 20-25) of the authorization status list in a fixed data area of e said rewritable storage medium (col. 26, line 62).

As per claim 16, Micali teaches a device (col. 26, line 8).

As per claim 17, Micali teaches a computer program for causing a processor to execute (col. 26, line 4).

As per claim 18, Micali teaches source device arranged for authorizing an operation by a sink device, the source device comprising authorization status checking means for verifying the authorization status of the sink device using an authorization status list (col. 21, lines 45-50)

As per claim 19, Micali teaches record carrier on which there is recorded an authorization status list (col. 26, line 67).

As per claim 20, Micali teaches a fixed data area and a rewritable data area, in which the authorization status list is recorded in the fixed data area (col. 26, line 67).

As per claim 21, Micali teaches a fixed data area and a rewritable data area, in which the authorization status list is recorded in the rewritable area and a cryptographic summary (col. 19, lines 20-25) of the authorization status list is recorded in the fixed data area (col. 26, line 62).

As per claim 22, Micali teaches a signal embodying an authorization status list (col. 26, line 4).

### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure is disclosed on the enclosed PTO-892 form.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MICHAEL R. VAUGHAN whose telephone number is (571)270-7316. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday, 7:30am - 5:00pm, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached on 571-272-3859. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/M. R. V./  
Examiner, Art Unit 2431  
/Syed Zia/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2431